

Invariance of quantum correlations under local channel for a bipartite quantum state.

Ali Saif M. Hassan^{1,*} and Pramod S. Joag^{2,†}

¹*Department of Physics, University of Amran, Amran, Yemen*

²*Department of Physics, University of Pune, Pune, India-411007.*

(Dated: September 25, 2012)

We show that the quantum discord and the measurement induced non-locality (MiN) in a bipartite quantum state is invariant under the action of a local quantum channel if and only if the channel is invertible. In particular, these quantities are invariant under a local unitary channel.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud;75.10.Pq;05.30.-d

Introduction : The characterization and quantification of quantum correlations in multipartite quantum systems is a fundamental problem facing quantum information theory [1–5]. Two principal approaches regarding quantum correlations consist of entanglement separability paradigm and the quantum- versus classical paradigm [2–23]. In the last decade the later approach generated intense research activity, as it was found that quantum correlations involved in separable states play a crucial role in some applications [24–26]. In the quantum vs. classical paradigm, the quantum correlations form the part of total correlations which arise over and above the classical correlations implied by a multipartite quantum state. Such quantum correlations are characterized by quantum discord (QD)[3, 4], measurement induced non-locality (MiN) [5], quantum deficit [30] etc. These quantum correlations can be a resource for a number of quantum information applications [6, 7, 27–29]. In this context it becomes important to understand the dynamics of these quantum correlations under local noise (local quantum operations).

The problem addressed here is the relation of the local quantum operation on a part of a bipartite system in a given state with the resulting change in quantum correlations as the state changes under such local operations with the possibility of changing quantum discord, especially with the possibility of transforming a zero discord state to a non-zero discord state under local quantum operations. For two qubit case it is shown that the qubit channel that preserves commutativity is either unital i.e. mapping maximal mixed state to maximal mixed state, or a completely decohering channel that nullifies QD in that state [31]. For $m \times 3$ system, it is shown that a channel acting on a second subsystem cannot create QD for zero QD states if and only if it is either a completely decohering channel or an isotropic channel [32]. It was further proved that a channel Λ transforms a zero QD state to zero QD state if and only if Λ preserves commutativity [32, 33]. The exact forms of unital channel for qubit system and that for the completely decohering channel for any system are also obtained [34].

In this brief report we obtain condition on the local channel operating on any bipartite system to preserve quantum correlations, namely the quantum discord and the MiN. This result is completely general and applies to any bipartite state.

Main results: Our idea is to express the mutual information $I(\rho)$ and the classical correlations $C_{A,B}(\rho)$ (defined below) in a bipartite state ρ in terms of the relative entropy involving two states ρ and σ given by

$$S(\rho||\sigma) = -S(\rho) - \text{tr}(\rho \log \sigma)$$

where $S(\rho)$ is the von-Neumann entropy of the state ρ . We then seek condition on the local quantum

*Electronic address: alisaif73@gmail.com

†Electronic address: pramod@physics.unipune.ac.in

operation so as to preserve $I(\rho)$ and $C_{A,B}(\rho)$ expressed in terms of the relative entropy. We need the following

Theorem 1 (Petz [35, 36]) : For states ρ and σ and a local quantum operation T

$$S(\rho||\sigma) = S(T\rho||T\sigma)$$

if and only if there exists a local quantum operation $\hat{T}$ such that

$$\hat{T}T\rho = \rho ; \hat{T}T\sigma = \sigma$$

We now state and prove the main results.

Lemma 1 : Let ρ_{AB} be a bipartite quantum state, $\Lambda_a : \rho_A \mapsto \Lambda_a \rho_A$; $\Lambda_b : \rho_B \mapsto \Lambda_b \rho_B$ be local quantum operations and $\rho_{A,B} = \text{tr}_{B,A} \rho_{AB}$. Then

$$I((\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b) \rho_{AB}) = I(\rho_{AB})$$

if and only if there exist quantum operations $\Lambda_{a,b}^* : \rho_{A,B} \mapsto \Lambda_{a,b}^* \rho_{A,B}$ such that

$$(\Lambda_a^* \otimes \Lambda_b^*)(\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b) \rho_{AB} = \rho_{AB},$$

and

$$(\Lambda_a^* \otimes \Lambda_b^*)(\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b) \rho_A \otimes \rho_B = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B.$$

Here $I(\rho)$ is the quantum mutual information in the state ρ_{AB} .

Proof : We use the definition of the quantum mutual information via relative entropy, namely,

$$I(\rho_{AB}) = S(\rho_{AB}||\rho_A \otimes \rho_B)$$

where $S(\rho)$ is the von-Neumann entropy of the state ρ . Then the result is immediate from Theorem 1. We just have to replace ρ by ρ_{AB} , σ by $\rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ and the quantum operation T by $\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b$. ■

Next we obtain the conditions on the map $(\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b)$ which leave the classical correlations in a bipartite quantum state ρ_{AB} unchanged. Classical correlations in a bipartite quantum state ρ_{AB} , with a POVM measurement defined by the set of positive operators $\{A_i^\dagger A_i\}$ ($\{B_i^\dagger B_i\}$) carried out on part A(B) can be expressed as [4]

$$C_{A,B}(\rho_{AB}) = \max_{\{A_i^\dagger A_i\}, \{B_i^\dagger B_i\}} [S(\rho_{B,A}) - \sum_i p_i S(\rho_{B,A}^i)] = \max_{\{A_i^\dagger A_i\}, \{B_i^\dagger B_i\}} \sum_i p_i S(\rho_{B,A}^i || \rho_{B,A}) \quad (1)$$

where $\rho_{B,A}^i = \text{tr}_{A,B} \rho^i$ is the reduced density operator of the density operator ρ^i prepared by the POVM measurement $\{A_i^\dagger A_i\}, \{B_i^\dagger B_i\}$ after i th outcome.

Lemma 2 : Let ρ_{AB} be a bipartite quantum state and $\Lambda_{a,b} : \rho_{A,B} \mapsto \Lambda_{a,b} \rho_{A,B}$ be the local quantum operations where $\rho_{A,B} = \text{tr}_{B,A} \rho_{AB}$. Then

$$C_{A,B}((\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b) \rho_{AB}) = C_{A,B}(\rho_{AB})$$

if and only if there exist local quantum operations $\Lambda_{a,b}^* : \rho_{A,B} \mapsto \Lambda_{a,b}^* \rho_{A,B}$ such that

$$(\Lambda_a^* \otimes \Lambda_b^*)(\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b) \rho_{AB} = \rho_{AB},$$

and

$$(\Lambda_a^* \otimes \Lambda_b^*)(\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b) \rho_A \otimes \rho_B = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B.$$

Here $C_{A,B}(\rho)$ denote the classical correlations in the state ρ as defined in Eq.(1).

Proof : Note that ρ_{AB} and hence ρ_A and ρ_B are arbitrary density operators so that the domain and the range of Λ and Λ^* cover the corresponding set of all density operators. In particular, for the states $\rho_{B,A}^i$ occurring in Eq. (1) $\Lambda_{b,a}^* \Lambda_{b,a}(\rho_{B,A}^i) = \rho_{B,A}^i$ and similarly for $\rho_{B,A}$. The result follows because by theorem 1 each term in the sum defining $C_{A,B}(\rho_{AB})$ (Eq.(1)) is invariant under the action of the local channels Λ_a and Λ_b as defined in the statement of the lemma. Hence the maxima over the corresponding POVMs $\{A_i^\dagger A_i\}, \{B_i^\dagger B_i\}$ are also invariant. ■

Theorem 2 : Let ρ_{AB} be a bipartite quantum state and $\Lambda_{a,b} : \rho_{A,B} \mapsto \Lambda_{a,b}\rho_{A,B}$ be the local quantum operations where $\rho_{A,B} = \text{tr}_{B,A}\rho_{AB}$. Then

$$D_{A,B}((\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b)\rho_{AB}) = D_{A,B}(\rho_{AB})$$

if and only if there exist local quantum operations $\Lambda_{a,b}^* : \rho_{A,B} \mapsto \Lambda_{a,b}^*\rho_{A,B}$ such that

$$(\Lambda_a^* \otimes \Lambda_b^*)(\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b)\rho_{AB} = \rho_{AB}.$$

and

$$(\Lambda_a^* \otimes \Lambda_b^*)(\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b)\rho_A \otimes \rho_B = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B.$$

Here $D_{A,B}(\rho_{AB}) = I(\rho_{AB}) - C_{A,B}(\rho_{AB})$ denote the quantum discord in the state ρ_{AB} . We also assume that the domain and the range of all the local maps cover the corresponding set of all density operators.

Proof : The result follows immediately from lemma 1 and lemma 2. ■

Note that a particular non-invertible local map may preserve discord of a particular state by reducing $I(\rho_{AB})$ and $C_{A,B}(\rho_{AB})$ by the same amount. Further, any local channel which decreases the discord will preserve the discord in a zero discord state.

In ref. [32] it is shown that a separable bipartite state

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i \rho_i^a \otimes \rho_i^b$$

is a zero discord (classical quantum) state if and only if $[\rho_i^b, \rho_j^b] = 0$. Obviously, such a zero discord state will remain a zero discord state under the action of a local channel Λ^b acting on the B part if and only if $[\Lambda^b \rho_i^b, \Lambda^b \rho_j^b] = 0$. Now $[\rho_i^b, \rho_j^b] = 0$ implies that ρ_i^b and ρ_j^b project on orthogonal subspaces. Thus Λ^b preserves the orthogonality and hence $I \otimes \Lambda^b$ can be invertible on the space of density operators pertaining to the whole bipartite system. However, if Λ^b satisfies $[\Lambda^b \rho_i^b, \Lambda^b \rho_j^b] = 0$ for *all* ρ_i^b, ρ_j^b then it maps the space of all density operators (acting on part B) into the subspace of commuting density operators and cannot be inverted. Indeed, such a map, called completely decohering map, destroys discord in any discordant state [37].

Next we deal with the invariance of MiN of a bipartite quantum system under the action of a local channel. We adopt the definition of MiN based on the quantum mutual information, namely, [38]

$$N(\rho_{AB}) = I(\rho_{AB}) - \min_{\{\Pi^a\}} I[\{\Pi^a\}(\rho_{AB})], \quad (2)$$

where $I(\rho_{AB})$ is the quantum mutual information and the minimum is taken over the local von-Neumann measurements leaving the reduced density operator ρ_A invariant.

Theorem 3 : Let ρ_{AB} be a bipartite quantum state and $\Lambda_{a,b} : \rho_{A,B} \mapsto \Lambda_{a,b}\rho_{A,B}$ be the local quantum operations where $\rho_{A,B} = \text{tr}_{B,A}\rho_{AB}$. Then

$$N_{A,B}((\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b)\rho_{AB}) = N_{A,B}(\rho_{AB})$$

if and only if there exist local quantum operations $\Lambda_{a,b}^* : \rho_{A,B} \mapsto \Lambda_{a,b}^* \rho_{A,B}$ such that

$$(\Lambda_a^* \otimes \Lambda_b^*)(\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b) \rho_{AB} = \rho_{AB}.$$

and

$$(\Lambda_a^* \otimes \Lambda_b^*)(\Lambda_a \otimes \Lambda_b) \rho_A \otimes \rho_B = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B.$$

Here $N_{A,B}(\rho_{AB}) = I(\rho_{AB}) - \min_{\{\Pi^{a,b}\}} I[\Pi^{a,b}(\rho_{AB})]$ denote the measurement induced non-locality (MiN) in the state ρ_{AB} . We also assume that the domain and the range of all the local maps cover the corresponding set of all density operators.

Proof : By lemma 1 both the terms defining $N_{A,B}(\rho_{AB})$ are invariant under the action of the local maps defined in the statement of the theorem. In particular, the second term $I(\Pi^{a,b}(\rho_{AB}))$ is invariant for all $\Pi^{a,b}$. Hence the minimum in the second term is invariant and the result follows. ■

The most useful invariant local quantum channels are the local unitary operators $\rho \mapsto U\rho U^\dagger$ and the anti-unitary operator $\Theta = UK$, U unitary and K the conjugation operator $\rho \mapsto UK\rho KU^\dagger$ [39]. However, the anti-unitary operator, which corresponds to the time-reversal is unphysical if applied to a part of a quantum system. Therefore, the anti-unitary local operators must act on both parts of the system. Thus we have shown, in particular, that the local unitary channel preserves quantum discord and measurement induced non-locality (the quantum version defined in Eq.(2)) for a bipartite quantum system. Finally, it will be interesting to search for the characteristics of local channels which increase discord in (possibly some class of) bipartite quantum states with non-zero discord.

Acknowledgments : This work was supported by the BCUD grant RG-13. ASMH acknowledges University of Pune for hospitality during his visit when this work was carried out.

-
- [1] M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
 - [2] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. 81, 865(2009).
 - [3] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 017901(2001).
 - [4] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A 34, 6899(2001).
 - [5] S.-L. Luo and S.-S. Fu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 120401(2011).
 - [6] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, and V. Vedral, e-print arXiv:1112.6238v1(2011).
 - [7] M. Lewenstein, B. Kraus, J. I. Cirac, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A 62, 052310(2001).
 - [8] K. Chen and L.-A. Wu, Quant. Inf. Comput. 3,193(2003).
 - [9] O. Rudolph, Lett. Math. Phys. 70, 57-64(2004).
 - [10] Y. Guo and J.-C. Hou, e-print arXiv:1009.0116v1.
 - [11] P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 1056(1999).
 - [12] E. Strmer, J. Funct. Anal. 254, 2303-2312(2008).
 - [13] Z.-J. Xi, H. Fan, and Y.-M. Li, Phys. Rev. A 85, 052102(2012).
 - [14] Z.-Z. Wang and D. Markham, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 210407(2012).
 - [15] Z.-Z. Wang and D. Markham, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 210407(2012).
 - [16] R. Augusiak, G. Sarbicki, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A 84, 052323(2011).
 - [17] S.-J. Wu, U. V. Pluhsen, and K. Mlmer, Phys. Rev. A 80, 032319(2009).
 - [18] M. Gessner, E.-M. Laine, H.-P. Breuer, and J. Piilo, Phys. Rev. A 85, 052122(2012).
 - [19] J. Siewert and C. Eltschka, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 230502(2012).
 - [20] J.-C. Hou and Y. Guo, Phys. Rev. A 82, 052301(2010); J.-C. Hou and X.-F. Qi, ibid. 81, 062351(2010); X.-F. Qi and J.-C. Hou, ibid.85, 022334(2012).
 - [21] X.-F. Qi and J.-C. Hou, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 44, 215305(2011); J.-C. Hou and Y. Guo, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 50, 12451254(2011); Y. Guo, X.-F. Qi, and J.-C. Hou, Chin. Sci. Bull. 56(9), 840846(2011); Y. Guo, J.-C. Hou and Y.-C. Wang, e-print arXiv: 1203.3933v1 (2012).
 - [22] S.-L. Luo and S.-S. Fu, Phys. Rev. A 82, 034302(2010).
 - [23] J.-C. Hou, J. Phys A: Math. Theor. 43, 385201(2010).
 - [24] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 5672 (1998).

- [25] A. Datta, S. T. Flammia, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 042316 (2005).
- [26] A. Datta and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 042310 (2007).
- [27] B. Dakic, V. Vedral, and C. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105, 190502(2010).
- [28] A. A. Qasimi and D. F. V. James, Phys. Rev. A 83, 032101(2011).
- [29] L. Roa, J. C. Retamal, and M. Alid-Vaccarezza, Phys. Rev. Lett. 107, 080401(2011).
- [30] J. Oppenheim, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 180402(2002).
- [31] A. Streltsov, H. Kampermann, and D. Bru, Phys. Rev. Lett. 107, 170502(2011).
- [32] X. Hu, H. Fan, D. L. Zhou, and W.-M. Liu, Phys. Rev. A 85,032102(2012)
- [33] S.-X. Yu, C.-J. Zhang, Q. Chen, and C. H. Oh, e-print arXiv:1112.5700v1(2011).
- [34] Yu Guo and Jinchuan Hou, e-print arXiv:1206.2159v4
- [35] D. Petz, Rev. Math. Phys. 15, 79 (2003).
- [36] P. Hayden et al., Commun. Math. Phys. 246, 359 (2004).
- [37] P.R. Halmos, *Finite-Dimensional Vector Spaces*, (Springer-Verlag New York Inc., 1987)
- [38] Ming-Liang Hu and Heng Fan, Annl. Phys. **327**, 2343 (2012).
- [39] J. J. Sakurai, *Modern Quantum Mechanics*, (Addison-Wesley, (1999))